

## REMARKS

This response is being filed after the decision on the Request for Rehearing and is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination, a Petition for “Suspension of action by the Office” requesting that prosecution in the above-referenced be suspended for three-months under 37 CFR § 1.103 (c) so that the Applicants can conduct the experiments necessary to produce the comparative data suggested by the Board in their Decision, and a check for the requisite fees for the Petition and the RCE.

Claims 1, 28 and 29 have been amended so that the transitional phrase “comprises” has been replaced by “consisting essentially of” when describing the resin film that is stretched in order to obtain a synthetic paper. By virtue of the fact that Claims 1, 28 and 29 as amended contain the “consisting essentially of” transitional language, any material that would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed synthetic paper is therefore excluded from the claims.

The Applicants would like to assure the Examiner that during the three month suspension of action by the Office by virtue of the 1.103 (c) Petition filed herewith, the Applicants intend to conduct “side-by-side” comparison experiments comparing the claimed synthetic paper with one of Takashi et al as suggested by the Board in the Decision on Appeal. Upon completion of the comparison study the Applicants anticipate filing an additional documents supporting patentability.

If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Leo G. Lenna", written over the printed name.

Leo G. Lenna

Registration No. 42,796

Attorney for Applicants

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, NY 11553  
(516) 228-8484

LGL/vjs